



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Number	Pages	Volume 9
1	1-2	C. Knapp: The Classics and Modern Life
3, 4	17-21, 25-29	H. H. Yeames: The Renaissance of Greek
13, 14, 15	97-98, 105-106, 113-114	C. Knapp: The Campaign for the Classics
18	137-138	C. Knapp: Horace and Smollett
18	138-141	A. A. Gendell: Latin in its Rightful Place
23	177-178	B. L. Ullman: Aims in the Teaching of Latin
28	217-218	W. B. McDaniel: On Some Critics of Students of the Classics C. K.

ROMAN LITERARY CHARACTERIZATION

Analysis is the most prominent feature in linguistic study. Questions of form and of grammatical relation are studied, with great care, and dependence and independence are looked at from every standpoint. In addition to these features, the flowers of speech may be sought with equal diligence in the study of poetry. More than two score kinds of Vergil's tropes and figures are mentioned in the Commentary of Servius; see J. L. Moore, *American Journal of Philology*, 12. 157-192, 267-292. The results of analysis are given by description. In contrast with this is characterization, which is synthetic, and is worthy of close study.

In analyzing and describing we look at the individuals; in characterization we look at the mass. If we consider the latter in terms of things that can be seen, it is the expression of a unified impression, a visual *e pluribus unum*. To get this we must withdraw ourselves until the many is lost in the one. Then on the landscape the rivers appear only as threads of silver. The splendor of the grass, the glory of the flower, the tint of leaves are no longer seen, and the trees themselves disappear in the forest. Or, if the appeal is through some sense other than that of sight, the unification of impressions is the result desired, and it finds expression in such terms as *suaviloquentiam*, *sonum Trachali*, *acerbitas*, and *iucunditas*, each expressing the sum-total of the sense-perceptions.

Characterization gives the face, description the features. Some illustrations of the latter will be given. The Brutus of Cicero gives us here and there many-sided views of men, and from their persons we must judge their oratory. Adjectives are chiefly used. In 28 it is said of the writers of the age of Thucydides that *grandes erant verbis, crebri sententiis, compressione rerum breves et ob eam ipsam causam interdum subobscuri*; in 63 Cato is like some of the Greeks, who are *acuti, elegantes, faceti, breves*; according to 129 Fimbria *habitus est sane, ut ita dicam, truculentus, asper, maledicus, genere toto paulo fervidior atque commotior*. By the side of these we may place the ununified description of Crassus as given in 143 *erat summa gravitas, erat cum gravitate iunctus facetiarum e urbanitatis oratorius, non scurrilis lepos, Latine loquendi accurata et sine molestia diligens elegantia, in*

disserendo mira explicatio . . . ; argumentorum et similitudinum copia. Nouns chiefly are used also in Pliny, Epp. 6.21.5 *non illi vis, non granditas, non subtilitas, non amaritudo, non dulcedo, non lepos defuit; ornavit virtutes, insectatus vitia, fictis nominibus decenter, veris usus est apte*. Descriptions giving forms of activity and the manner are illustrated by Pliny, Epp. 2.3.3 *Isaeus . . . prooemiatur apte, narrat aperte, pugnat acriter, colligit fortiter, orna excelsa, postremo docet, delectat, adficit, quid maxime, dubites, crebra ἐνθυμήματα, crebri syllogism, circumscripti et effecti*. . . . Compare with this Cicero Brutus 164 *multa in ea oratione graviter, multa leniter, multa aspere, multa facete, dicta sunt* (the nouns *gravitas, lenitas, asperitas, facetiae* might have been used).

When one attempts to characterize the composite picture by a summative term, use must be made of adjectives or nouns, adverbs or verbs, as in description. In the use of such terms writers differ. Cicero is inclined to use adjectives, such as *acer* and *vehemens*, *non infans* and *disertus*, so that he does not show every orator distinct from the rest. Still he has some good illustrations of the use of nouns, as in Brutus 89 *elegantiam in Laelio, vim in Galba*. . . . Still better is De Oratore 3.28 *Suavitatem Isocrates, subtilitatem Lysias, acumen Hyperides, sonitum Aeschines, vim Demosthenes habuit*. . . . *Gravitatem Africanus, lenitatem Laelius, asperitatem Galba, profluens quidam habuit Carbo et canorum*. Rarely is literary movement indicated by a verb, as in Brutus 58 *latrant enim iam quidam oratores, non locuntur*. Compare Quintilian 2.9.12 *a viro bono in rabulam latratoremque convertitur*; 10.1.52 *raro assurgit Hesiodus*; 10.1.96 *Horatius . . . insurgit aliquando*. The best example of this, however, is in Fronto (page 114, in Naber's edition), which will be quoted later.

The source from which the characterizing material is taken is one of the most interesting features of the study. The Younger Pliny, Epp. 3.5.6, has in regard to the *Historia Naturalis* of his uncle the following: *nec minus varium quam ipsa natura*. This we can put into one word, *varietas*, well characterizing his assembled host of different facts. Looking elsewhere at the terms which have been used, we find that objects in nature, and man, either in his physical or in his psychical nature, are taken to shadow forth literary qualities.

The portrayal of Pindar as a downrushing mountain torrent in Horace, Odes 4.2.5-8, is well known:

Monte decurrens velut amnis, imbres
quem super notas aluere ripas,
fervet immensusque ruit profundo
Pindarus ore.

Compare with this the statement in Quintilian 10.1.61 *velut quodam eloquentiae flumine*. Far different is the view of Lucilius given by Horace, in Sermones 1.4.11 *cum flueret lutulentus*—a veritable Cumberland at high water mark. Quintilian (10.1.78) says of Lysias, *puro tamen fonti quam magno flumini propior; in*

10.1.62 he says of Stesichorus, *redundat et effunditur*. Compare with these the longer statement in 12.10.19 *neque fontibus puris neque torrentibus turbidis sed lenibus stagnis similes habentur*.

Taking the river as the central place, let us group around it the things that are seen representing the literary work of men.

The mighty trees that fringe the river's bank show us the meaning of the characterization of Ennius in 10.1.88¹: *Ennium sicut sacros vetustate lucos adoremus, in quibus grandia et antiqua robora iam non tantam habent speciem quantam religionem*. But there are also younger trees, which have *quidam uber iucundus sucus*, of which Cicero speaks, Brutus 36, *sucus ille et sanguis incorruptus usque ad hanc aetatem oratorum fuit, in qua naturalis inesset, non fucatus nitor*. Here we find a *floridum* (12.10.58) and a *floridius genus* (2.5.18), and here also *efflorescat non multum inter se distantium tempore oratorum ingens proventus* (12.10.11). In the overblooming class some put Cicero himself, for in their judgment he was *nimiis floribus*. But, in addition to the flowers, there are also the light and the shade, and we find it said in 9.1.25 that Cicero quidem omnia orationis lumina in hunc locum congerit; and, in 10.5.16, that intulisse eloquentiae lumen. Above the river is the gleaming sky. So a divine glimmer was seen in Theophrastus (10.1.83), but was lacking in Pacuvius. Menander, dark with excessive light, fulgore quodam suae claritatis tenebras obduxit (10.1.72); and above all is Pericles, a veritable Jove, quem fulminibus et caelesti fragori comparant comici (12.10.24), and further, in 12.10.65 hanc vim et celeritatem in Pericle miratur Eupolis, hanc fulminibus Aristophanes comparat, haec est vera dicendi facultas.

A few other terms from other external sources will be given. We find in Cicero Brutus 262 qui volent illa calamistris inurere. Similar is Orator 78: tum removebitur omnis insignis ornatus quasi margaritarum; ne calamistri quidem adhibebuntur. For the *calamistri*, 'curling irons', compare Arnobius 2.41: idcirco animas dedit . . . nec in formis erubescerent masculorum calamistris vibrare caesariem. In Tacitus, Dialogus 26.2, they are used to indicate the effeminacy of the style of Maecenas: malim hercule C. Gracchi impetum aut L. Crassi maturitatem quam calamistros Maecenatis aut tinnitus Gallionis. Compare Suetonius Augustus 86 exagitat . . . in primis Maecenatem suum, cuius myrobrechis, ut ait, concinnos usque quaque persequitur et imitando per iocum irridet. Equally noticeable is the characterization in Cicero, Brutus 64 genere toto strigosior. The same adjective is used by Livy in 27.47.1 to describe the Roman horses as they appeared to the eyes of Hasdrubal just before the battle of the Metaurus.

Taking as our guide the proposition qualis homo ipse est, talis eius est oratio (Cicero, Tusc. Disp. 5.47), we

may expect to find man's mental work set forth in terms derived from his physical as well as his mental and moral traits. Cicero himself gives an indication of this (ibidem, § 46): *Anticlea laudat Ulix pedes abluens, Lenitudo orationis, mollitudo corporis*. Negative terms are not commonly used, for there is need of positive qualities to justify enrollment among the elect of literature. Still there are a few, as in 12.10.14 unde nunc quoque aridi et exsuccus et exsanguis. Hi sunt enim, qui suae imbecillitati sanitatis appellationem . . . obtundunt. Only a few positive terms need be given as examples: plurimum sanguinis atque nervorum (10.1.60); carnis tamen plus habet, minus lacerorum (10.1.77); non athletarum toros sed militum lacertos (10.1.33). The training places are also contrasted in 10.1.79 palaestrae quam pugnae magis accommodatus, just as declamations and orations are in 10.2.12 minus sanguinis ac virium declamationes habeant quam orationes. Notice in 10.1.2 solida atque robusta oratio. The transfer to the activities of man is easy, and the characterization in 10.1.102, immortalem illam Sallusti velocitatem, can be characterized by its own adjective.

Words expressing personal and mental traits are freely used; *vis* and *gravitas* are staple terms. In 1.7.35 *nitidus* is applied to Messalla without suggestion, however, of the conditions mentioned by Quintilian in 10.1.43 recens haec lascivia deliciaeque et omnia ad voluptatem multitudinis imperitiae composita delectant. We take what is said of Cassius Severus in 10.1.117 as an indication that different taste-perceptions might be developed in the same writer: nam et ingeni plurimum est in eo et acerbitas mira et urbanitas eius summa.

The larger part of the characterizations are in the works of Cicero and Quintilian. The latter is the superior, as he had the benefit of all the critical scrutiny after the age of Cicero. The Brutus of Cicero, and the tenth book of Quintilian are portrait galleries; in Quintilian 10.1 we see what title had been won by the best writers of Greece and Rome. Yet other views are occasionally found elsewhere. Ennius used the expressions suaviloquenti ore Cethegus, flos delibatus populi and Suadae medulla (Cicero, Brutus 58-59). While it may smack too much of the modern to translate Suadae medulla by 'the spinal cord of Persuasion', these words certainly give as much force as the terms quoted by Cicero. We find a view of some of the predecessors of Horace in Horace, Epp. 2.1.55-59:

aufert
Pacuvius docti famam senis, Accius alti,
dicitur Afrani toga convenisse Menandro,
Plautus ad exemplar Siculi properare Epicharmi,
vincere Caecilium gravitate, Terentium arte.

Ovid counted among his friends Marsus magnique Rabinus oris Iliacusque Macer sidereusque Peto (see Ex Ponto 4.16.5-6). Martial, closing 11.80 with the line quid gaudiorum est Martialis et Baiae!, at least suggests that a picture of his work can be found in the countless dimplings of the sea at Baiae.

¹When the work is not named the reference is to Quintilian.

Most of the figures shown to us are isolated, though there are a few variously colored groups of men. One from Cicero, *De Oratore* 3.28 has already been quoted. Three others will be given entire, and then we shall call attention to some of the figures differently portrayed. We find in Tacitus, *Dialogus* 18.9 the following: sic Catoni comparatus C. Gracchus plenior et uberior, sic Graccho politior et ornator Crassus, sic utroque distinctior et urbanior et altior Cicero, Cicerone mitior Corvinus et dulcior et in verbis magis elaboratus; and, again, 25.18: adstrictior Calvus, nervosior Asinius, splendidior Caesar, amarior Caelius, gravior Brutus, vehementior et plenior et valentior Cicero. Here are used eighteen adjectives, one-third of which are applied to Cicero, three in each passage. In 10.1.108 it takes three nouns to describe him: mihi videtur . . . effinxisse vim Demosthenis, copiam Platonis, iucunditatem Isocratis. The *Dialogus* passages are noticeable for their adjectives, just as Quintilian 12.10.11 is for its nouns: hic vim Caesaris, indolem Caeli, subtilitatem Calidi, diligentiam Pollionis, dignitatem Messallae, sanctitatem Calvi, gravitatem Bruti, acumen Sulpici, acerbitatem Cassi reperimus; in his etiam, quos vidimus, copiam Senecae, vires Africani, maturitatem Afri, iucunditatem Crispi, sonum Trachali, elegantiam Secundi. Of the fifteen terms given, *copiam Senecae* is the one suggesting the greatest breadth. Most of the others can be arranged in pairs indicating kindred or contrasted qualities: indoles: vires, diligentia; vis, dignitas: gravitas, acumen; subtilitas, acerbitas: maturitas, elegantia: iucunditas, and in addition sonus and sanctitas. But the most ambitious display is to be found in Fronto (page 113, Naber's edition). Fronto begins by mentioning eleven artists and their subjects, and then continues: In poetis autem quis ignorat ut gracilis sit Lucilius, Albius aridus, sublimis Lucretius, mediocris Pacuvius, inaequalis Accius, Ennius multiformis? Historiam quoque scribere Sallustius struere, Pictor incondite, Claudius lepide, Antias invenuste, Seisenna longinque, verbis Cato multiugis, Caelius singulis. Contionatur autem Cato infeste, Gracchus turbulente, Tullius copiose. Iam in iudiciis saevit idem Cato, triumphat Cicero, tumultuatur Gracchus, Calvus rixatur. And then, as if this were not enough, he follows with a double view of six philosophers. Here are mingled adjectives and nouns, adverbs and verbs, and we can only regret that he should have selected men most of whom are not in the other pictures. However, the fact that he uses *triumphat* and *copiose* of Cicero indicates that he recognized his supremacy. But, when we compare the three pictures, we find *splendidior* and *vim* applied to Caesar, *adstrictior*, *sanctitas* and *rixatur* to Calvus, *amarior* and *indoles* to Caelius, *nervosior* and *diligentia* to Pollio. The characterizations of Brutus (in the *Dialogus gravior*, in Quintilian *gravitas*) agree; those of Messalla are the most unlike. These resemblances as well as the differences suggest an examination to see whether there really is in a literary worker or his work

anything that impels the critic to the use of a certain epithet.

If the entire mass of Latin criticism had been preserved, we should probably have more divergent views than we now possess. We should probably have more that is an index of personal pique rather than of fair judgment. One illustration of this has been saved in *Dialogus* 18.23. . . . epistulas ex quibus facile est deprehendere Calvum quidem Ciceroni visum exanguem et aridum, Brutum autem otiosum atque diiunctum; rursusque Ciceronem a Calvo quidem male audisse tamquam solutum et enervem, a Bruto autem, ut ipsius verbis utar, tamquam fractum atque elumbem. Compare Quintilian 9.4.1; 12.19.14; 11.1.17 ff. While there may be here and there a caricature, there may also be repetitions in the manner of the Hamlet-Polonius incident (Shakespeare, *Hamlet* 3.2):

Hamlet. Do you see yonder cloud that is almost in shape of a camel?

Polonius. By the mass, and 't is like a camel, indeed.

Hamlet. Or like a weasel.

Polonius. It is backed like a weasel.

Hamlet. Or like a whale?

Polonius. Very like a whale.

But, however much or little there may be of these two kinds of portrayal, we need only ask whether there is a fairly distinct characterization for different men and for different spheres of work. To answer this we shall examine the first chapter of the tenth book of Quintilian.

We shall not follow him at every step, but only far enough to see whether historians and orators, philosophers and poets are presented in different ways. We might expect such terms to be used as will indicate that we have an unemotional portrayal of facts by the philosophers, and emotional by the historians, and showing that the work of the orator is dynamic, that the aim of the poet is serenity. According to Quintilian, the best philosophers have *iucunditas* and *elegantia*; thus, e. g. there is in Xenophon *illa iucunditas inaffectata*. There is found *historicus nitor*, *vis* in the best orators, and *sublimitas* in the poets, though there is *acerbitas* in the writers of satire. The last is also the characteristic of Cassius Severus, though he was not a satirist. Ancient comedy is *et grandis et elegans et venusta*, while Terence and Tibullus, as also Lysias, are *elegantes*, though *elegantia* is the mark of Caesar and Secundus (12.10.10), and also of Laelius in Cicero, Brutus 89. *Gravitas* distinguishes Accius, Antimachus and Sophocles, and *gravis* is applied to Aeschylus, Caesar and Calvus. *Iucunditas* is seen in Xenophon, Cicero, Livy and Horace. Isocrates and Messalla are *nitidi*, and there is *nitor* in Cicero, Cornelius Celus and Secundus, but it is most noticeable in Theophrastus's *loquendi nitor ille divinus*. *Vis* is found in Antimachus, Caesar, Cicero and Demosthenes. As may be seen from this, the writers in the same sphere may seem akin, or one may seem to belong to several spheres, as

Cicero, to whom are assigned the characteristics of three Greeks in 10.1.108. It might be judged from the above that characterization is an indefinite exercise, but to show it in definite terms we shall consider the propriety of *urbanitas* for Caelius, *vis* for Caesar, *lactea ubertas* for Livy, and *harena sine calce* for Seneca.

Cicero says (Brutus 170): *Externis quasi oratoribus idem quod urbanis tribuo, praeter unum, quod non est eorum urbanitate quadam quasi colorata oratio. Et Brutus Qui est, inquit, iste tandem urbanitatis color? Nescio, inquam; tantum esse quendam scio.* A little later (177) Cicero applies the term to C. Julius Caesar Strabo Vopiscus. But what is its fitness when applied to Caelius by Quintilian in 10.1.115? He ranked as one of the greatest of Rome's orators, and as an adept political plotter and social intriguer; his name, like that of Catullus, is associated with the Palatine Medea—the ill-famed Clodia. He writes to the absent Cicero: *pollicitus sum me omnes res urbanas diligentissime tibi perscripturum*, and Cicero, *Ad Familiares* 8, gives evidences of his skill in the collection of news; compare e.g. 8.7.3 Paula Valeria, soror Triari, *divortium sine causa, quo die vir e provincia venturus erat, fecit; nuptura est D. Bruto.* That he touched the life of his day at every point is shown not only by the accusations of his enemies (Cicero, *Pro Caelio* 35), but also by the admission of Cicero (*ibid* 27): *qui nullum convivium renuerit, qui in hortis fuerit, qui unguenta sumpserit, qui Baias viserit.* We may well imagine that, if polite society at Rome had been called on to decide to whom belonged the palm for urbanity, with one accord all would have pointed at Caelius. If *qualis homo, talis oratio* is true, the color of the work of Caelius is certainly given by the term *urbanitas*.

More than one critic speaks of the *vis* of Caesar, and this images the sum total of his activities. It is reflected in the words *tacta alea est* (Suetonius, Caesar 32), and in *veni, vidi, vici*. Let us call this characteristic *vis*. In Caesar as a boy there was many a Marius, and the skilful carelessness with which he threw on his toga marked him as the first of dandies. The prince of spendthrifts, he would have been Rome's greatest orator if he had not been her greatest general. Shakespeare, through Cassius, describes Caesar as the foremost man of all this world, and, since he was a human dynamo, *vis* would properly characterize him as a man. But is there *vis* in his writings? Neither in the 770 ablatives absolute in the Gallic War (Heynacher), nor in the 630 instances of secondary sequence, nor in the 500 subject accusatives with the infinitive do we find a reflection of *vis*. A methodical search calls our attention to many a long sentence, but nowhere anything that equals *veni, vidi, vici*. We try the results of chance, and, with eyes shut, put our finger on B. G. 7.20, and find the first period in the fourteenth line. Another trial gives us B. C. 1.17.2, a sentence seven lines in length. So far as the *Bellum Civile* and the *Bellum Gallicum* are concerned, the application of *vis* to them is merely an illustration of *qualis homo, talis oratio*.

We must judge the *lactea ubertas* of Livy, and his *mira iucunditas clarissimusque candor* from his work alone. This is a treasure-house of great stories, and a portrait gallery of the heroes of more than seven hundred years, and each portrayal is illuminated by the radiance of Livy's religious faith. Asinius Pollio wrote of a certain Patavinus, professing to find in Livy's style some traces of the place from which he came; but Quintilian saw in that style a radiance, and felt a creamy richness. One sentence will show the richness, and the suggested radiance of the marble Rome of Augustus gleaming from the temple of distant Alba: 1.29.5 *voces etiam miserabiles exaudiebantur, mulierum praecipue, cum obsessa ab armatis templa augusta praeterirent ac velut captos relinquerent deos.* . . . , 'And mournful cries, especially of the women, kept coming to the ear when they were passing by the august temples blockaded by armed men and were leaving, if we may call them so, their captive gods'. Here we find color of tense, of adjective, and of particle, and the contrasted sorrow, exultation or humiliation of women, men and gods.

One of the greatest figures in Roman literary history is the philosopher Seneca; he was fine picking for the critics. Quintilian admitted the wide range of his work in 12.10.11 *copiam Senecae*; and mentions the items in 10.1.129 *nam et orationes eius et poemata et epistolae et dialogi feruntur.* But his manner is defective: *sed in eloquendo corrupta pleraque atque eo perniciosissima, quod abundabat dulcibus vitiis.* Gellius quotes from Seneca in 12.2, but only to condemn, and adds in § 11: *sed iam verborum Senecae piget; haec tamen inepti et insubidi hominis ioca non praeteribo.* But there is no other criticism which reveals so much about the critic as that of Fronto. Seneca, *Epistles* 87.10, writes: *ita non omnibus obesis mannis et asturconibus et tolutariis praeferres unicum illum eum ab ipso Catone defricum.* Fronto had evidently read this, and from it he obtained a figure for his criticism (155–156, Naber): *eloquentiam . . . Senecae, mollibus et febriculosis prunuleis insitam, subvertendam censeo radicitus, immo vero Plautino trato verbo, exradicitus. Neque ignoro copiosum sentiis et redundantem hominem esse: verum sententias eius tolutares video nusquam quadripido concito cursu tenere, nusquam pugnare, neque maiestatem studere, ut Laberius, dictabolaria immo dicteria potius eum quam dicta continere.* But he goes even beneath this (page 157): *at enim sunt quaedam in libris eius scite dicta, graviter quoque nonnulla. Etiam laminae interdum argentiolae cloacis inveniuntur.* Passing by the jewels in the sewer, we may note that the words *prunuleis, tolutares* and *dictabolaria* would have made Quintilian gasp and stare. Macrobius (*Saturnalia* 2.1.14) tells us of *dicta* and *dicteria*, but *dictabolaria*, 'wordslinging', we have from Fronto. But to get the real measure of the style of Seneca we must go back to the madman Caligula.

Suetonius gives us two specimens of the wonderful critical sense of the Emperor. One of these characterizes his grandmother Livia as *Ulixes stolatus* (Caligula, 23); the other characterizes the style of Seneca as *commissiones meras*, and *harena sine calce* (Caligula, 53). The unconnected character of the sentences of Seneca was present to the mind of Macaulay also; they seemed to him a succession of mottoes. So we may put aside Fronto, Gellius, and even Quintilian, and take Caligula, in this respect, as the best painter of them all. But there is the suggestion for another good characterization in the words of Seneca himself, Epp. 100.7: *lege Ciceronem: compositio eius una est . . . at contra Pollionis Asini salebrosa et exsiliens et, ubi minime expectes, relictura*. Quintilian (11.2.46) has *salebrosa oratio*, but does not apply it to any writer. Had Pollio had a chance to pass judgment on Seneca, he might have called attention to traces of *Cordubensitas*; see Cicero, Pro Archia 26 *Cordubae natis poetis, pingue quiddam sonantibus*. On the other hand Fronto might have used *salebrosa* rather than any adjective that he did, for, making the transfer from walk to wall, it best expresses the unevenness of the surface where the stones have been laid without mortar.

Two of these characterizations show that the critics thought that there was a definite reflection of the worker in his work, and this is also shown by what Quintilian (10.1.114) writes of Caesar: *tanta in eo vis est, id acumen, ea concitatio, ut illum eodem animo dixisse, quo bellavit, appareat*. The other two show that, not knowing the worker, we may discover the fundamental tone of the work and set it forth in verbal terms. Though the exact color or the content of these can not be mathematically determined, yet for literature the attainment of them is akin to the nationalizing of all the states, for they are the expression of the *e pluribus unum*.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,
NASHVILLE, TENN.

R. B. STEELE.

REVIEW

The Defeat of Varus and the German Frontier Policy of Augustus. By William A. Oldfather and H. V. Canter. University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Volume IV, No. 2, June, 1915 (University of Illinois Bulletin, Volume XII, No. 42). Pp. vi + 118. 75 cents.

In 1909, which was the nineteen-hundredth anniversary of the battle in the Teutoburg Forest, there was in Germany "an extraordinary outburst of celebrations, addresses, memorials, and monographs giving expression to what was universally regarded as the first and not the least glorious chapter of German achievement, the 'deed of Arminius'". Professor Oldfather says in the Preface to the work under review, and in a paper in The Classical Journal 11.226-236, that he has cherished "misgivings as to the historical justification of this view of the defeat of Varus".

The results both of much thought and of much labor are now set forth in the article under review.

The study before us challenges a well-nigh universal historical verdict, namely, that the defeat of Varus by Arminius in the year 9 A. D. was a turning point of world history. With that are bound up several other considerations of Roman policy and the status of Germany which will appear as the review proceeds. The authors have devoted four chapters to their study. In the first chapter a general view of the question is taken, in the second the Sources are set forth, in the third there is a criticism of the Accepted View, and in the fourth and last chapter the New Interpretation of the authors is offered.

The German and English writers on Roman history practically all agree that the Emperor Augustus intended to subjugate Germany as far as the Elbe river, and that this intention was frustrated by the defeat of Varus and the annihilation of his three legions. Different historians have different reasons for crediting such an intention of expansion to Augustus, but the perfervid enthusiasm displayed by German and English writers alike over the saving of the fine independence of the Germans seems to savor of patriotic extravagance, and to hark back to that time a few years ago when Teutonic-Anglo-Saxonic victories were well deserved at the expense of the effete Romans and mollycoddle Gauls! The Roman victory at Alesia, although it made Vercingetorix the national hero of France, stopped forever Celtic national civilization; the Roman defeat in the Teutoburg Forest saved Germanic national civilization.

So wrote our authorities. Under patriotic circumstances that sounds fine enough. But, in fact, Professors Oldfather and Canter do not need to use any argument here at all. They simply suggest that this so-called liberation—in point of fact a divorce from the civilizing contact with Rome—left the Germans without any literature, monuments, or culture, "until they again came into relations with that great transmitter of civilization, Rome, in the person of Rome's new representative, Charlemagne".

There are but four ancient accounts of the battle in the Teutoburg forest: Cassius Dio 56. 18-23; Florus 2. 30. 21-39; Velleius 2. 117-120; Tacitus, Annales 1. 60-62. Dio and Florus both wrote in the second century A. D., both were rhetoricians, and, although Dio is much more to be trusted than Florus, still both were quite unwilling to let historical truth stand in the way of a rhetorical antithesis. Velleius should be the best source for the history of the time, because he is the only contemporary writer who mentions the Varus episode. But Velleius is so openly a panegyrist of the Emperor Tiberius that nearly everything he says is a mixture of bias, animus, and flattery. Varus was in command in Germany just before Tiberius's second command there. So Varus is blamed that Tiberius may be exalted.